## REMARKS

STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 53-55 and 58 are pending.

Claims 53-55 and 58 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Schakelford (U.S. Patent 5,265,206).

Claims 53-55 and 58 are amended, and, thus, claims 53-55 and 58 remain pending for reconsideration, which is respectfully requested.

No new matter has been added in this Amendment. The foregoing rejection is hereby traversed.

## REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner maintains from the previous office action the rejection of claims 53-55 and 58 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schakelford (US Patent No. 5,265,206). To reject the newly amended claim recitation, "a list storing at least one pointer that indicates at least one function that is executed when the message is received," the Examiner newly relies on Schakelford, FIG. 18 and column 6, lines 16-23 in page 3 of the Office Action.

The Examiner's rationale rejecting the claims is based upon the Examiner's assertion on page 3 of the final Office Action: "given the broadest reasonable interpretation of followed claims in light of the specification." Therefore, in view of the Examiner's assertion, after a more detailed review of present Application FIGS. 101-105 and page 177, line 7 to page 183, line 9, which support the pending claims 53-55 and 58, and a more detailed review of Schakelford, the Applicants respectfully assert that Schakelford does not disclose or suggest the claimed invention, as follows.

First, Schakelford discloses implementing an Object Manager and Messenger for an OOPS. In an OOPS, the purpose of the Object Manager is to provide object to object messaging support to facilitate the object oriented programming paradigm, and the Object Manager includes the Messenger as a component. See, Schakelford, Abstract, column 3, lines 18-39. Accordingly, the descriptions of Schakelford that the Examiner relies upon to reject the claims all relate to the Object Manager and the Messenger operations in an OOPS, such as Schakelford, column 1, lines 32-41, column 4, line 62 to column 5, line 36, and column 6, lines 10-23 and FIG. 18.

4

Second, thus, in contrast to Schakelford, the present claimed invention is directed to defining an OOPS object, as supported by FIGS. 101-105 and page 177, line 7 to page 183, line 9 of the present Application. In other words, Schakelford, FIGS. 2-3, column 4, lines 5-12, and column 6, line 66 to column 7, line 9, do not disclose or suggest, and in fact are absolutely silent, on the present claimed invention's:

> ... a <u>component ... as one object in combination with existing software</u> having a graphical user interface, ... issuing an event of the existing software in response to a message issued in another object ... (claim 53, emphasis added).

In other words, Schakelford does not disclose or suggest building/defining an object that "includes" an existing software by including data related to the existing software and as operation methods of the existing software, storing, for example, an application drive program to start the existing software and an event generation program related to providing generated events to the existing software, as shown in FIG. 101 and described in page 178, line 4 to page 179, line 14 of the present Application. Therefore, an OOPS object (component A) according to the present invention is shown in FIG. 101, in which the object includes a data portion and a method portion, both related to an existing software A. A benefit of the claimed invention is a scheme of replacing existing software by an object independently of types of the existing software through providing an object in combination with the existing software (e.g., page 177, lines 7-16 and page 179, lines 12-15, of the present Application).

Therefore, in contrast to Schakelford, claims 53-55 and 58 are amended to clarify the patentably distinguishing features of the present claimed invention, using claim 53 as an example, as follows.

53.     (CURRENTLY AMENDED) A <u>computer readable storage that stores object oriented programming objects accessible by objects</u> ~~component storage medium~~, comprising:

a data structure that <u>defines a component to serve</u> ~~storage for a component which serves~~ as one object in combination with existing software having a graphical user ~~interface, said component~~ <u>interface, by storing data related to the existing software having the graphical user interface and storing as an operation method related to the existing software, a program code controlling a data processing system according to a process of</u> issuing an event of the existing software in response to a <u>received</u> message issued in another <u>object</u> ~~object; and~~

~~a list storing at least one pointer that indicates at least one function that is executed when the message is received.~~

5

In contrast to Schakelford, the present claimed invention as recited in independent claim 58 provides:

> 58. (CURRENTLY AMENDED) A method ~~for~~of replacing an existing software having a graphical user interface with one object oriented programming object accessible by objects, ~~driving an application, having a graphical user interface, of a component,~~ comprising:
>
> monitoring the existing software ~~the application~~ having the graphical user interface for a predetermined event;
>
> defining a data structure for a component that serves as the one object in combination with the existing software having the graphical user interface, by storing data related to the existing software having the graphical user interface and storing as an operation method related to the existing software, a program code controlling a data processing system according to a process of ~~when the predetermined event is issued,~~ issuing a message to inform another ~~component~~object of the predetermined event of the existing software ~~event; and~~
>
> ~~executing at least one function that is indicated by at least one pointer that is stored in a list~~.

In view of the remarks and the claim amendments, withdrawal of the rejection of pending claims and allowance of pending claims is respectfully requested.

## CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

Respectfully submitted,
STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: _July 23, 2004_       By: _____

Mehdi Sheikerz
Registration No. 41,307

1201 New York Avenue; NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501